

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION

————— MEETING SUMMARY —————

Oak Grove Regional Park Boat House
4520 West Eight Mile Road
Stockton, CA

Saturday, July 29, 2000 – 1:00 p.m.

(approved 08/16/00, as amended)

1. Meeting was called to order by Chair Gutierrez at 1:10 p.m. All commission members were in attendance except for Commissioner Fujii (arrived at 1:50 p.m.). Chair Gutierrez called for introductions of commissioners and members of the public.
2. Recommendations from Planning Subcommittee
 - Evaluating Letters of Intent
 - Evaluating Proposals
 - Composition of Proposal Review Panel

Paul Harder and Nadya Dabby of Harder+Company led the discussions of each of the above topics, which culminated in the following motions:

Motion: Approve the Letter of Intent review process as recommended and direct staff to summarize the letters for the commission. (Flenoy–Kelley/Grande – Motion passed 8–0)

Motion: Approve the criteria for evaluating proposals as amended. (Criteria listed below.) (Adubofour/Snider – Motion passed 8–0)

- Experience in providing similar services
- Specific plans and capacity to address the need for culturally appropriate services (including language)
- Ability to be accessible to all service users
- Appropriateness of workplan
- Cost–effectiveness
- Ability to comply with evaluation requirements
- Ability to manage client data management
- Must comply with the requirements for being part of an integrated system
- Intent to collaborate with other agencies
- The proposal rating scale should allow for the reviewer to adjust the total score for overall fundability (see United Way’s Program Scoring Summary); this score adjustment would have defined parameters and a cap of ten extra points.

- The four initiatives (parent education, children’s health, child care and drug, alcohol and tobacco prevention and treatment) should be addressed or weighted
- The commission should specify how much of the funding is available for each of the four types of program support (program services, special projects, capital financing, and matching funds)
- Indicate how the provider will identify and reach their target population.
- Identify other funding sources

Motion: Approve the recommendation pertaining to composition of the Proposal Review Panel as follows: “The panel should be diverse in regard to ethnic composition, geographic representation, and the professional fields they represent. Panelists will be required to sign a conflict of interest statement. They will also be required to disclose their affiliations prior to reviewing applications; they will excuse themselves from reviewing a specific application if they work directly with the applicant. The proposals’ rankings (which will be presented to the Commission) will be an average of the individual panelists’ tallies.” (Snider/Flenoy–Kelley – Motion passed 8–0)

3. Discussion on Content of Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

Paul Harder reviewed the recommendation of the Planning Subcommittee to allocate funding to the four Program Service Initiatives and for Special Projects. Discussion was held on the appropriate timing to establish funding allocations.

Motion: Approve the recommended process to allocate funds to the four Program Service Initiatives and for Special Projects. (Fujii/Mitchell – Commissioners Gutierrez, Mitchell, Vera, Flenoy–Kelley, Fujii, Smith voted YES, Commissioners Snider, Grande, and Adubofour voted NO – Motion passed 6–3)

Commissioners were asked to individually suggest allocation percentages for each of the categories. After averaging and rounding the figures, the following allocations were produced:

Parent Education	20%
Children’s Health	25%
Child Care	25%
Drug, Alcohol, Tobacco Prevention & Treatment	15%
Special Projects	15%

Motion: Approve the funding allocations as discussed. (Adubofour/Grande – Motion passed 9–0)

Mr. Harder and Ms. Dabby led the commission in a discussion regarding questions that should be part of the Request for Proposals:

1. Should the RFP set aside specific funding amounts to be allocated to each community within the County?

Motion: The RFP should not allocate specific funding amounts by community. (Snider/Smith – Commissioners Gutierrez, Mitchell, Flenoy–Kelley, Smith, Snider, Adubofour voted YES, Commissioner Vera voted NO, Commissioner Fujii abstained – Motion passed 6–1.)

2. Should the RFP prioritize proposals aimed at high priority service needs?
3. Should the RFP prioritize proposals aimed at high need communities?
4. Should the RFP prioritize proposals aimed at high need populations?

Motion: The RFP should give priority to proposals aimed at high priority service needs, high need communities, and high need populations. (Mitchell/Adubofour – Commissioners Gutierrez, Mitchell, Vera, Flenoy–Kelley, Smith, Snider, Adubofour voted YES, Commissioner Fujii voted NO. Motion passed 7–1)

5. Should the RFP require applicants to provide projected numbers of people served and units of service delivered?

Motion: The RFP should require applicants to provide projected numbers of people served and units of service delivered. (Fujii/Flenoy–Kelley – Motion passed 8–0)

6. Should the RFP include a request for applicants to provide training, consistent with the plan?

Motion: The RFP should require applicants to participate in training, consistent with the Plan. (Flenoy–Kelley/Fujii – Motion passed 8–0)

- 7a. Should the RFP allow proposals to include administrative costs?

Motion: The RFP should allow proposals to include administrative costs. (Mitchell/Flenoy–Kelley – Motion passed 8–0)

- 7b. Should the RFP cap administrative costs included in the proposals?

Motion: The RFP should allow administrative costs up to 15%. (Mitchell/Smith – Commissioners Mitchell, Vera, Smith, Snider, Adubofour voted YES, Commissioners Gutierrez, Flenoy–Kelley, Fujii voted NO – Motion passed 5–3)

8. Should the RFP include proposals aimed at procurement of computers and related costs?

Motion: The RFP should allow proposals which include the cost of procuring computers and other related items necessary to further the goals of Prop 10 (Adubofour/Smith – Commissioners Mitchell, Vera, Flenoy–Kelley, Fujii, Smith,

Snider, Adubofour voted YES, Commissioner Gutierrez voted NO – Motion passed 7–1)

9. Should funding be for three years, depending on annual evaluation results?

Motion: The RFP should allow multi–year proposals, up to three years. (Snider/Adubofour – Motion passed 8–0)

10. Should the RFP reflect the requirement to provide integrated and comprehensive services system?

Motion: The RFP should require integration of services. (Fujii/Snider – Motion passed 8–0)

4. Discussion of Timelines

The commission deliberated the many issues involved in implementing the Strategic Plan from the development of the RFP through the issuance of contracts. The desire to expedite the process was strongly expressed by commissioners as well as the desire to set timelines that allowed for adequate planning and implementation of the steps necessary to arrive at a successful outcome.

The following schedule was developed:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Develop RFP/Request for Letter of Intent | Week of September 11, 2000 |
| 2. Provide mandatory orientation and technical assistance | |
| 3. Receive and review Letters of Intent | Week of October 9, 2000 |
| 4. Recommend collaborations | |
| 5. Invitations to submit proposals | Week of October 23, 2000 |
| 6. Seat review panels | |
| 7. Assist with proposal development | |
| 8. Review proposals | Week of November 27, 2000 |
| 9. Negotiate agreements | |
| 10. Develop contracts | January 2001 |

Motion: Accept the proposed schedule. (Mitchell/Flenoy–Kelley – Commissioners Gutierrez, Mitchell, Flenoy–Kelley, Fujii voted YES, Commissioner Vera voted NO – Motion passed 4–1)

5. Discussion on Evaluation and Contract Monitoring

In light of the relatively short time remaining for this work session and the diminishing availability of Commissioners, these issues were deferred to the regular scheduled meeting in September.

6. Public Comments: None
7. Comments from Commission Members

Commissioner Fujii expressed concern about the timeline for development of the evaluation plan. Mr. Harder responded that the plan would require further work. Commissioner Flenoy–Kelley inquired about the definition of “Special Projects” and Mr. Harder said that would also be addressed.

8. Meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, August 16, 2000 – 7:00 a.m. at Public Health Auditorium (1601 E. Hazelton Avenue, Stockton). (*Fujii/Flenoy–Kelley – Motion passed 5–0*)